

## PROPOSAL EVALUATION

### *IRWM Grant Program – Planning Grant, Round 1, FY 2010-2011*

<b>Applicant</b>	Marin Municipal Water District	<b>County</b>	Sonoma, Napa, Solano, Contra
<b>Project Title</b>	San Francisco Bay Area IRWM Plan Update		Costa, Alameda, Santa Clara, San Mateo, San Francisco, Marin
		<b>Grant Request</b>	\$ 842,556
		<b>Total Project Cost</b>	\$1,412,317

**Project Description** The proposed project is the update of the San Francisco Bay Area Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Plan adopted in December 2006, so that it would be consistent with Proposition 84 IRWM Plan Standards. The new plan will develop objectives based on local and program criteria. The updates include new and current regional data/information and the development of new regional maps. The plan will improve the participation of DACs and community based groups, stakeholders outreach for the solicitation of new projects and describe project review process and criteria for potential funding while promoting LIDs.

#### **Evaluation Summary**

<b>Scoring Criterion</b>	<b>Score</b>
Work Plan	12
DAC Involvement	8
Schedule	8
Budget	8
Program Preferences	7
Geographic Balance	0
<b>Total Score</b>	<b>43</b>

- **Work Plan** The work plan follows the scoring criterion, but is not supported thoroughly by documentation or sufficient rationale. The plan fully addresses what and how the RWMG will be doing and the effort will result in a complete and compliant plan; however, the plan is lacking when it comes to substantiating the tribal outreach effort, the regional description of land and water use, the description of DACs and ethnic groups, data management QA/QC, and the technical analysis sources.
- **DAC Involvement** The work plan provides tasks for facilitating and supporting DACs within the IRWM region, but does not sufficiently detail description of DACs and the process to be used. The applicant provided a general map of where the DACs are located within the region and demonstrated that more collaboration with the DACs will occur in the future plan; however, it's not clear how they will be reached and how they will be supported. The resources dedicated towards the DACs seem really insufficient, especially because some of the DACs are yet to be identified.
- **Schedule** The schedule coincides with the items in the work plan, but rationale for the planned times is unclear. One month for a final draft and three months for a draft plan does not seem feasible. No time was allotted for the review of the draft.
- **Budget** The budget in the proposal presents detailed cost information as described in Attachment 4 and the costs are considered reasonable, but the supporting documentation for some of the plan tasks are not fully supported or lack detail. Most of the items in the work plan are addressed, though no rationale is given for the times and rates. Specifically, work item 5 is completely lacking rationale and not addressed adequately.
- **Program Preference** The proposal demonstrates a high level of certainty that seven program preferences will be implemented. Those program preferences are: include regional projects or programs, effectively integrate water management programs and projects within a hydrologic region, CALFED Bay-Delta Program objectives, climate change, expand environmental stewardship, integrated flood management, surface and groundwater protection.
- **Geographic Balance** Not Applicable